



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,448	01/09/2002	Edwin Kong-Sun Ho	005925.P001	8466
7590	05/03/2006		EXAMINER	
Christian A. Nicholes BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			BORISSOV, IGOR N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3639	
			DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/044,448	HO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Igor Borissov	3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION
Response to Amendment

Amendment received on 2/17/2006 is acknowledged and entered. Claims 34-75 have previously been canceled. Claims 1, 12, 23 and 27 have been amended. Claims 1-33 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 10 and 21 include the term "may", which indicated a potential capability, but not an actual method step.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 7-10, 27 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sofer et al. (US 6,920,487) in view of Wang et al. (US 5,365,520).

Independent Claims

Claim 1. Sofer et al. (Sofer) teaches a computer-implemented method for maintaining and distributing wireless applications to mobile devices, comprising:

receiving a call for a service from a mobile device (said call including a service dialed number (short code)) (C. 3, L. 35-37);

selecting a response to the call based upon a service dialed number (short code) selected to address the call, said service dialed number (short code) including information representing a unique code for routing the call (translating short code information into routing instructions) (C. 3, L. 47-49; C. 4, L. 23-27); and information uniquely identifying the service (said short codes representing specific services) (C. 6, L. 12-28; C. 7, L. 35-40);

initiating a dialog between a server and the mobile device (establishing an interactive voice response for additional input from said mobile device) (C. 6, L. 40-42; C. 7, L. 7-18).

Sofer does not explicitly teach that said service dialed number (short code) includes at least a *first segment and a second segment*.

Wang et al. (Wang) teaches a system and method for dynamically routing a dialed signal, said signal including at least a first segment and a second segment (routing short code), said method including routing the signal in accordance with information obtained from said first and second segments ((Figs. 3 and 8; C. 6, L. 65 – C. 7, L. 5; C. 12, L. 36-48).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer to include that said service dialed number (short code) includes at least a first segment and a second segment, as disclosed in Wang, because it would advantageously allow to provide a mobile operator with sufficient intelligence to enable to route the call to a particular destination via appropriate nodes without having the participants of the call being aware of the specifics of the routing path, as specifically stated in Wang (C. 5, L. 47-59).

Claim 27. Sofer teaches a computer-readable medium having instructions embedded therein which, when implemented by a computer, causing said computer to perform a method for maintaining and distributing wireless applications to mobile devices, comprising:

receiving, from a network computer telephony integrated system, data about a call received from a mobile device (said call including a service dialed number (short code)) (C. 3, L. 35-37); and

initiating a dialog between a server (gateway) and the mobile device (establishing an interactive voice response for additional input from said mobile device) (C. 6, L. 40-42; C. 7, L. 7-18); said dialog including a response to be selected based upon a service dialed number (short code) selected to address the call, said service dialed number (short code) including information representing a unique code for routing the call (translating short code information into routing instructions) (C. 3, L. 47-49; C. 4, L. 23-27); and information uniquely identifying the service (said short codes representing specific services) (C. 6, L. 12-28; C. 7, L. 35-40).

Sofer does not explicitly teach that said service dialed number (short code) includes at least a *first segment and a second segment*.

Wang et al. (Wang) teaches a system and method for dynamically routing a dialed signal, said signal including at least a first segment and a second segment (routing short code), said method including routing the signal in accordance with information obtained from said first and second segments ((Figs. 3 and 8; C. 6, L. 65 – C. 7, L. 5; C. 12, L. 36-48).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer to include that said service dialed number (short code) includes at least a first segment and a second segment, as disclosed in Wang, because it would advantageously allow to provide a mobile operator with sufficient intelligence to enable to route the call to a particular destination via appropriate nodes without having the participants of the call being aware of the specifics of the routing path, as specifically stated in Wang (C. 5, L. 47-59).

Dependent Claims

Claims 3. Determining, from the call, a subscriber identifier (Sofer; C. 7, L. 65 – C. 8, L. 1).

Claim 7. Selecting, based upon a first subset of the information, the server to select the response (Sofer; C. 6, L. 29-48; C. 7, L. 35-40).

Claim 8. Identifying, based upon a second subset of the information, data independent of the server and a recipient of the call (Sofer; C. 6, L. 12-28).

Claim 9. Said method as in Claim 8, wherein said data is a product (type of service) (Sofer; C. 6, L. 12-28).

Claim 10. Selecting the information via cell phone interface (Sofer; C. 6, L. 15-21).

Claim 31. Selecting, based upon a first subset of the information, a server to select the response (Sofer; C. 6, L. 29-48; C. 7, L. 35-40). As per “push” feature, see reasoning applied to Claim 12.

Claim 32. Identifying, based on a second subset of the information, data independent of the server and a recipient of the call (Sofer; C. 6, L. 12-28).

Claim 33. Said medium wherein said data is a product (type of service) (Sofer; C. 6, L. 12-28).

Claims 4, 5, 12, 14-21, 23, 25, 26, 28 and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sofer et al. in view of Wang et al. and further in view of Mehta et al. (US 2002/0131404 A1).

Independent Claims

Claims 12 and 23. Sofer teaches a computer-readable medium having instructions embedded therein which, when executed by a computer, causing said computer to perform a method for maintaining and distributing wireless applications to mobile devices; and system, said system including a network computer telephony integrated system and a plurality of servers/gateways; said method comprising:

receiving a call from a mobile device (said call including a service dialed number (short code)) (C. 3, L. 35-37); and

sending information about the call to a server to initiate a dialog between a server (gateway) and the mobile device (establishing an interactive voice response for

additional input from said mobile device) (C. 6, L. 40-42; C. 7, L. 7-18); said dialog including a response to be selected based upon a service dialed number (short code) selected to address the call, said service dialed number (short code) including information representing a unique code for routing the call (translating short code information into routing instructions) (C. 3, L. 47-49; C. 4, L. 23-27); and information uniquely identifying the service (said short codes representing specific services) (C. 6, L. 12-28; C. 7, L. 35-40).

Sofer does not explicitly teach that said service dialed number (short code) includes at least a *first segment and a second segment*. Also, Sofer does not specifically teach that said server (receiving information about the call) is a *push server*.

Wang et al. (Wang) teaches a system and method for dynamically routing a dialed signal, said signal including at least a first segment and a second segment (routing short code), said method including routing the signal in accordance with information obtained from said first and second segments ((Figs. 3 and 8; C. 6, L. 65 – C. 7, L. 5; C. 12, L. 36-48).

Mehta et al. (Mehta) teaches a computer-implemented method and system for maintaining and distributing wireless applications to mobile devices, said system including: a computer network, a provisioning server, and a deployment server having “*push*” behavior capability [0110], [0132]; said method comprising: receiving a request (call) for an application from a customer’s mobile device; and responding to the call based upon information identified for response [0136]; [0138].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer to include that said service dialed number (short code) includes at least a first segment and a second segment, as disclosed in Wang, because it would advantageously allow to provide a mobile operator with sufficient intelligence to enable to route the call to a particular destination via appropriate nodes without having the participants of the call being aware of the specifics of the routing path, as specifically stated in Wang (C. 5, L. 47-59).

And it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer in view of Wang to include that said server

(receiving information about the call) is a *push* server, as disclosed in Mehta, because it would advantageously allow to relieve the subscriber from having to actively retrieve desired application/information from the Web, thereby providing the convenience to the subscriber.

Dependent Claims

Claim 14. Determining, from the call, a subscriber identifier (Sofer; C. 7, L. 65 – C. 8, L. 1).

Claims 4, 15 and 28. Sofer in view of Wang teaches all the limitations of Claim 3, except specifically teaching *determining, based upon the subscriber identifier, a set of capabilities of the mobile device*.

Mehta teaches a computer-implemented method and system for maintaining and distributing wireless applications to mobile devices, comprising:

determining whether the device has the resources and other capabilities specified by the application profile that corresponds to the requested application [0136].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer in view of Wang to include *determining, based upon the subscriber identifier, a set of capabilities of the mobile device*, as disclosed in Mehta, because it would advantageously insure that the subscriber get full access to the requested service/application.

Claims 5, 16 and 29, Mehta teaches said method and system, including determining compatible file formats for the identified subscriber device [0148]. The motivation to combine references would be insuring that the subscriber get full access to the requested service/application.

Claim 18. Said system wherein said server selects, based upon a first subset of the information, a server to select the response (Sofer; C. 6, L. 29-48; C. 7, L. 35-40). As per “push” feature, see reasoning applied to Claim 12.

Claim 19. Said system wherein a second subset of the information identifies data independent of the server and a recipient of the call (Sofer; C. 6, L. 12-28).

Claim 20. Said system as in Claim 19, wherein said data is a product (type of service) (Sofer; C. 6, L. 12-28).

Claim 21. Said system wherein the information is selected via cell phone interface (Sofer; C. 6, L. 15-21).

Claim 25. Determining, from the call, a subscriber identifier (Sofer; C. 7, L. 65 – C. 8, L. 1).

Claim 26. Selecting the information via cell phone interface (Sofer; C. 6, L. 15-21).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sofer et al. in view of Wang et al. and further in view of Larsson (US 6,304,757).

Dependent Claims

Claim 2. Sofer in view of Wang teaches all the limitations of Claim 2, except specifically teaching *terminating the call prior to an answering of the call*.

Larsson teaches a method for providing telecommunications services to a plurality of mobile users in a telecommunications network, wherein, when a subscriber notifies the telephone exchange that he/she has transferred to an other area, he/she *terminates the connection before the telephone exchange unit has answered the call*, thereby avoiding cost to the telephone exchange unit (C. 8, L. 53-60).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer in view of Wang to include *terminating the call prior to an answering of the call*, as disclosed in Larsson, because it would advantageously allow subscribers to avoid unnecessary cost, as specifically indicated in Larsson (C. 8, L. 53).

Claims 6, 13, 17, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sofer et al. in view of Wang et al. further in view of Mehta et al. and further in view of Larsson.

Dependent Claims

Claims 13 and 24. Sofer in view of Wang and further in view of Mehta teaches all the limitations of Claims 13 and 24, except specifically teaching *terminating the call prior to an answering of the call*.

Larsson teaches a method, system and computer-readable medium for providing telecommunications services to a plurality of mobile users in a telecommunications network, wherein, when a subscriber notifies the telephone exchange that he/she has transferred to an other area, he/she *terminates the connection before the telephone exchange unit has answered the call*, thereby avoiding cost to the telephone exchange unit (C. 8, L. 53-60).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer in view of Wang and further in view of Mehta to include *terminating the call prior to an answering of the call*, as disclosed in Larsson, because it would advantageously allow subscribers to avoid unnecessary cost, as specifically indicated in Larsson (C. 8, L. 53).

Claims 6, 17 and 30. Sofer in view of Wang and further in view of Mehta teaches all the limitations of claims 6, 17 and 30, except specifically teaching that said format includes *two-way SMS*.

Larsson teaches said method, system and computer-readable medium, wherein the employed communication channel is SMS (C. 9, L. 20-21).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer in view of Wang and further in view of Mehta to include that said mobile devices include SMS capability, as disclosed in Larsson, because it would advantageously allow to communicate without incurring excessive costs.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sofer et al. in view of Wang et al. and further in view of Thornton (US 6,751,454 B2).

Dependent Claims

Claim 11. Sofer in view of Wang teaches all the limitations of claim 11, except specifically teaching that said response includes *instructing the mobile device to connect to the server*.

Thornton teaches a method and system for sampling audio recording on a cell phone, wherein, after establishing a first data connection to the data server computer, if a consumer wants to select a particular audio of interest while navigating through a menu system, the data server computer instructs the wireless device to terminate the first data connection and establish a voice connection with an audio server computer (C. 2, L. 40-42; C. 7, L. 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer in view of Wang to include that said response include *instructing the mobile device to connect to the server*, as disclosed in Thornton, because it would advantageously allow subscribers to review or “try” various applications prior to purchasing them, thereby decrease the amount of “returns”.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sofer et al. in view of Wang et al. further in view of Mehta et al. and further in view of Thornton.

Dependent Claims

Claim 22. Sofer in view of Wang and further in view of Mehta teaches all the limitations of Claim 22, except specifically teaching that said response include *instructing the mobile device to connect to the server*.

Thornton teaches a method and system for sampling audio recording on a cell phone, wherein, after establishing a first data connection to the data server computer, if a consumer wants to select a particular audio of interest while navigating through a menu system, the data server computer instructs the wireless device to terminate the

first data connection and establish a voice connection with an audio server computer (C. 2, L. 40-42; C. 7, L. 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sofer in view of Wang and further in view of Mehta to include that said response include *instructing the mobile device to connect to the server*, as disclosed in Thornton, because it would advantageously allow subscribers to review or "try" various applications prior to purchasing them, thereby decrease the amount of "returns".

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Igor Borissov whose telephone number is 571-272-6801. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IB

4/26/2006



IGOR N. BORISOV
PRIMARY EXAMINER